DOCKET NO: 271369US6PCT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :

YOSHIYUKI NEZU, ET AL. : EXAMINER: PIPALA, EDWARD

SERIAL NO: 10/535,308 :

FILED: MAY 18, 2005 : GROUP ART UNIT: 3663

FOR: IN-VEHICLE APPARATUS AND METHOD OF PROVIDING CONTENTS

## PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated December 21, 2006, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse the Group I, drawn to an in-vehicle map and video display apparatus, and list Claims 1-5, and 12 as readable thereon.

Applicants traverse the outstanding requirement as the outstanding requirement has not established that an undue burden would be required if the requirement was not issued and if all the claims were examined together. More particularly, MPEP §803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

In the present application no undue burden has been established if each of the claims were examined together.

Application No. 10/535,308 Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2006

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Restriction Requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-14 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Bradley D. Lytle Attorney of Record Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown Registration No. 42,866

I:\ATTY\DPB\6541 SONY\271369US\271369US-ELEC.DOC

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See MPEP 821.01.